

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of November 16, 2005. Claims 1-36 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 25, and 35. Applicant has also added claims 37-39. Consequently, claims 1-39 remain pending in the present Application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 25 to recite that the aspect(s) of the startup applications are automatically analyzed based on at least one criteria that indicates whether a portion of the plurality of startup applications is extraneous at startup. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification, page 7, line 18-page 8, line 20 and step 104 of the method 100. Applicant has amended claim 25 to correct an error, reciting “a startup sequence” instead of “the” startup sequence. Applicant has amended claim 35 to recite the computer system “of claim 34” instead “of claim 35.” Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments do not change the scope of claims 25 and 35. Applicant has also added claims 37-39. Support for these new claims can be found in the specification, page 7, lines 8 -14. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that no new matter is added.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 25 and 35 as containing informalities. Applicant has amended claims 25 and 35 to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s objections to claims 25 and 35 have been addressed.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,794,052 (Harding). In so doing, the Examiner cited col. 4, lines 19-20 for monitoring startup applications, col. 4, line 31-33 and 51 as analyzing

aspect(s) of the startup applications against certain criteria, and col. 14, lines 29-33 and Fig. 3, step 590 as automatically removing the startup applications from the startup sequence.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiners rejection. Claim 1 recites a method for controlling a startup sequence in a computer system. The method recited in claim 1 includes the steps of monitoring at least one aspect of a plurality of startup applications launched during the startup sequence. Claim 1 further includes automatically analyzing the at least one aspect of the plurality of startup applications to based on at least one criteria. The criteria indicate whether a portion of the plurality of startup applications is extraneous at startup. The method recited in claim 1 also includes automatically removing from the startup sequence at least one of the portion of the plurality of startup applications that are extraneous. Claims 13 and 25 recite analogous computer-readable medium and an analogous computer system.

Thus, using the method, computer-readable medium and computer system, extraneous startup applications may be removed. Such applications might include, but are not limited to those which terminate early, crash, are unused, use unavailable hardware, or spyware. Specification, page 7, line 18-page 8, line 20. Consequently, performance of the computer system may be improved.

Harding, in contrast, is focused on allowing a user to select a particular language for use in conjunction with the computer system. Harding, Abstract. In particular, the cited portion of column 4, as well as column 4 in general, describes a modular approach to loading software on a computer system. However, Applicant has found no mention in col. 4 of monitoring startup applications and no mention of analyzing the startup applications with respect to certain criteria. Harding, col. 14 does describe removing applications. However, the cited portion of Harding specifically states that the modules relating to “non-selected” languages are removed. Harding,

col. 14, lines 29-33. More specifically, Harding states that a Universal Language Master (ULM) program is loaded onto the computer system. Harding, col. 6, lines 9-15. In addition, modules for every language supported are also loaded. Harding, col. 6, lines 16-24. The ULM program prompts the user to select a language. Harding, col. 6, lines 38-41. Only those files which are specific to the language selected by the user are kept, while the remaining files related to non-selected languages are removed. Harding, col. 6, lines 61-64.

Thus, although Harding discloses maintaining only certain files related to the selected language, Harding does so in response to a user's selection of the language. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Harding does not monitor startup applications, nor does Harding automatically analyze the startup applications with respect to certain criteria. Instead, Applicant respectfully submits that Harding is more similar to the described prior art, in which the user selects applications for removal. Specification, page 2, line 21-page 3, line 14 and Figure 2. Stated differently, Harding selects a particular set of applications (corresponding to a language) to retain and thus effectively selects the remaining applications (corresponding to the non-selected language) for removal. As a result, Harding fails to teach or suggest monitoring the system, automatically analyzing its behavior and automatically removing startup applications based on the analysis. Thus, Harding fails to teach or suggest the method, computer-readable medium and system recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-12 and 14-23, and 26-36 depend upon independent claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 2-12 and 14-23, and 26-36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-12 and 14-23, and 26-36 are allowable over the cited references.

Moreover, claims 3-6, 8, 15-18, 20, 21-30, and 32 are separately allowable over the cited references. Claims 3-6, 8, 15-18, 20, 21-30, and 32 cite specific criteria used in analyzing the startup applications, such as the method of termination for the application, the termination time, the crash rate, the use of an icon, and whether hardware is available. Applicant has found no mention in Harding of these specific criteria. Accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-6, 8, 15-18, 20, 21-30, and 32 are separately allowable over the cited references.

New claims 37-39 depend upon claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 1, 13, and 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable over the cited references.

Moreover, claims 37-39 are separately allowable over the cited references. Claims 37-39 specific criteria used in analyzing the startup applications, such as whether specific Internet addresses are accessed. Applicant has found no mention in Harding of these specific criteria. Accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that claims 37-39 are separately allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

February 17, 2006
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540